

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-13 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 27 are amended by incorporating the features of claim 2 to further define the invention. Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14-26 are previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-13 and 27 are presently pending in the application.

**Petition filed on January 30, 2007**

As stated in the Statement and Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on March 28, 2007, the present application was abandoned because of technicality. In order to revive the unintentionally abandoned application, a petition to revive abandoned application was filed on January 30, 2007. However, to this date, Applicant has not received a written response from the Office of Petition. As such, Applicant respectfully files this Amendment to ensure that a response to the Non-Final Office Action dated January 3, 2007 is recorded and thereby maintain the pendency of the present application.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b)**

Claims 1-13 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 27, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “the organic emission material is a polymer emission material.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of at least independent claims 1 and 27, hence dependent claims 3-13 which dependent from claim 1. Thus, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-13 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: June 4, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Sumiyo Onda

Reg. No. L0289

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001